

**Remarks**

Claims 1-24 are pending.

Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as purportedly anticipated by US 6,000,813 (Krietzman). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants note that the cited reference has an issue date of December 14, 1999. Since the present application has a filing date of December 13, 2000, the citation of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is inapposite.

Regarding claims 2 and 3, the Office Action cites col. 3, lns. 26-31 of Krietzman for a purported disclosure of a device comprising a plurality of laser elements. While Krietzman suggests the combination of visible and non-visible laser elements, Krietzman fails to specifically teach or suggest a device comprising a plurality of visible-light laser elements capable of emitting beams at different visible frequencies. (Compare also Krietzman at col. 2, lns. 29-33.) This capability is important to the function of a laser pointer as an aid in the visual presentation of information, as described in the present claims. This rejection should be withdrawn with regard to claims 2, 3, 5 and 6.

Regarding claims 5 and 6, the Office Action cites col. 3, lns. 26-31 of Krietzman for a purported disclosure of a device wherein no more than one laser diode may be actuated at any one time. No such disclosure of such a device is found at that citation, or anywhere in Krietzman. For that additional reason, this rejection should be withdrawn with regard to claims 5 and 6.

Claims 1, 4 and 7-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over US 6,000,813 (Krietzman) taken alone.

In order to establish prima facie case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP § 2143.03. Krietzman fails to disclose or suggest a device weighing no more than 450 grams. The Office Action erroneously states that the applicant has not disclosed that the weight of the device solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose. The application does make such a disclosure, both implicitly and explicitly, e.g. at page 4, lines 28-31. Since no prima facie case of obviousness has been established with regard to claims 1, 22, 23 and 24, this rejection should be withdrawn.

In order to establish prima facie case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP § 2143.03. As noted above,

Krietzman fails to disclose or suggest a device wherein no more than one laser diode may be actuated at any one time. Since no prima facie case of obviousness has been established with regard to claims 4 and 19, this rejection should be withdrawn.

In order to establish prima facie case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP § 2143.03. Krietzman fails to disclose or suggest a device comprising collimating optics. Although Krietzman discusses numerous options for the addition of optics for modification of a beam, Krietzman fails to disclose or suggest a device comprising collimating optics. Again, although Krietzman discusses numerous options for optical modification of a beam, Krietzman fails to disclose or suggest a device emitting any collimated beam. Indeed, Krietzman distinguishes and criticizes a device having a “collimated output” in the “Background of the Invention” section (col. 1, lns. 37-41), and therefore directly teaches away from such a device. In addition, Krietzman fails to disclose or suggest a device emitting parallel beams. Krietzman fails to disclose or suggest a device emitting beams which are collimated beams and which are substantially parallel. Since no prima facie case of obviousness has been established with regard to claims 7-9, this rejection should be withdrawn.

In order to establish prima facie case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP § 2143.03. Krietzman fails to disclose or suggest a device wherein at least one laser element emits light at a red, orange or yellow visible wavelength and at least one laser element emits light at a green, blue or violet visible wavelength. Krietzman fails to disclose or suggest a device wherein at least one laser element emits light at a red visible wavelength and at least one laser element emits light at a green or blue visible wavelength. Krietzman teaches only “a solid-state diode in the 532-690 nm range” (col. 3, ln. 38-39), which range encompasses green, yellow, orange and red wavelengths. Since no prima facie case of obviousness has been established with regard to claims 10-15, this rejection should be withdrawn.


In order to establish prima facie case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP § 2143.03. Krietzman fails to disclose or suggest a device wherein at least one laser element is a green-emitting II-VI semiconductor laser diode. Krietzman fails to disclose or suggest a device wherein at least one laser element is a red-emitting III-V semiconductor laser diode. Krietzman fails to disclose or

suggest a device wherein at least one laser element is comprises a green-emitting frequency-doubled laser. The Office Action erroneously states that the applicant has not disclosed that the choice of laser element solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose. The application does make such a disclosure, both implicitly and explicitly, e.g. at page 3, lines 11-21. Since no prima facie case of obviousness has been established with regard to claims 16-21, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Examination and consideration of the application as amended is requested and allowance of claims 1-24 at an early date is solicited.

8/15/03  
Date

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Philip Y. Dahl, Reg. No.: 36,115  
Telephone No.: (651) 737-4029

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833